



30 JAN 2009

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

47533

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW OFFICE OF JOEL VOELZKE  
24772 Saddle Peak Road  
Malibu, CA 90265

In re Application of  
SINCLAIR *et al*  
U.S. Application No.: 10/539,655  
PCT No.: PCT/AU2003/001691  
Int. Filing Date: 18 December 2003  
Priority Date: 18 December 2002  
Attorney Docket No.: 123-003  
For: ELONGATED ELECTRICAL  
CONDUCTOR THAT IS ADAPTED  
FOR ELECTRICALLY CONNECTING  
WITH AN ELECTRICAL CONTACT

**DECISION ON  
RENEWED PETITION  
UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)**

This decision is in response to applicants' renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) filed 01 December 2008.

**BACKGROUND**

On 13 November 2008, a decision dismissing applicants' 37 CFR 1.47(a) petition was mailed. Applicants were given two months to respond.

On 01 December 2008, applicants filed a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) which was accompanied by, *inter alia*, a declaration by Matthew Ward and other documentary evidence in support of the renewed petition.

On 15 December 2008, an Office Action was mailed indicating that applicant had only two months to provide an acceptable declaration and granted petition.

**DISCUSSION**

The original petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) was dismissed for failing to show that a complete copy of the above-captioned application including specification, claims and drawings were presented to the nonsigning inventor. Moreover, the email correspondence was deemed not to show a clear refusal to cooperate.

In the renewed petition, the 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicants provided evidence that a complete copy of the Australian priority application was provided to the nonsigning inventor on 18 December 2002. **This is not sufficient.**

For a refusal to be accepted, petitioners must provide a complete copy of the

10/539,655

**subject application**, including specification, claims and drawings to the nonsigning inventor. Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers, but the nonsigning inventor refused to accept delivery or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. See § 409.03(d)(II) MPEP.

Accordingly, item (2) of 37 CFR 1.47(a) is not yet satisfied.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants' renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

**The Office Action mailed 15 December 2008 is VACATED to the extent that the time period to respond with a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) or a declaration is two months with no extensions of time available.**

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are available.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter may be filed electronically via the USPTO EFS-Web, by facsimile to (571) 273-0459, or if mailed addressed to Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

*James Thomson*  
James Thomson  
Attorney Advisor  
Office of PCT Legal Administration

Tel.: (571) 272-3302